REMARKS

Claims 49, 58, and 67 are amended hereby. No claims are canceled or added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 49-75 will remain pending.

In the Final Office Action dated August 14, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 49-51, 57-60, 66-69, and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,975) in view of Zellweger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,582). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 52-56, 61-65, and 70-74 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi et al. in view of Zellweger et al. and further in view of Nomura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,877,772). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections and, therefore, respectfully traverses the same.

Claims 49-75 are patentably distinguishable over the references cited by the Examiner because they have been amended to recite a method of operating on data on a computer system, a computer system for operating on data, and a computer-readable memory medium encoded with program data representing a computer program that can cause a computer to implement a method of operating on data, all of which combine a number of features including, among them, where at least one grouping rule defines at least one breakpoint corresponding to the user-definable number of groups, the at least one breakpoint defining numeric ranges of the numerical data, and where application of the at least one rule to the numerical data divides the data into groups based on the at least one breakpoint to reduce the resolution of the numerical data where the grouping of the data is visualized by associating colors to the data groups in a multi-dimensional data set. None of the references cited by the Examiner disclose or suggest such combinations of features. As a result, the Applicant respectfully submits that the references do not render any of claims 49-75 unpatentable.

So as not to repeat the arguments presented previously, the Applicant incorporates the remarks presented by the Amendment filed on January 11, 2006, herein by reference. To address the comments provided by the Examiner in the Final Office Action dated August 14, 2006, the Applicant provides the following additional remarks.

The Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's comments with respect to Nomura et al. In particular, the Applicant acknowledges that Nomura et al. discusses the application of colors to regions of a text picture. Specifically, Nomura et al. describes that a region 82 may be painted with a medium red color, a region 83 may be painted with a medium green color, a region 84 may be painted with a dark blue color, a region 85 may be painted with a light blue

color, and regions 86 and 87 may be painted with a medium green color. (Nomura et al. at col. 20, lines 41-45.) The regions 82-87 refer to regions on a graphical display (*i.e.*, a pie chart) as illustrated in Fig. 8, for example. (Nomura et al. at Fig. 8.) As discussed in the reference, the smaller the area to be colored, the higher the chroma value for the color selected for that area. (Nomura et al. at col. 19, lines 28-36.) This assists in avoiding unbalanced highlighting. (Nomura et al. at col. 19, lines 34-36.)

Nomura et al. selects the color to be painted based on the size of the area to be colorized. (Nomura et al. at col. 19, line 59, through col. 20, line 15.) In other words, the amount of visual space occupied determines the color applied to that visual space. (Nomura et al. at Fig. 8, for example.) This is quite different from the operation of the present example where cells in a table, for example, are colored according to the numerical range in which the value falls. The Applicant respectfully points out that, contrary to the present invention, Nomura et al. does not apply a rule to numerical data to group data by associating colors to the data groups in a multi-dimensional data set. As a result, with the clarifying language added to claims 49, 58, and 67, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner cannot rely on Nomura et al. to defeat the patentability of claims 49-75. In addition, as discussed previously, the remaining two references do not assist the Examiner with a rejection of the claims.

As recognized by the Examiner, Taniguchi et al. does not describe grouping values with reference to at least one breakpoint. As pointed out by the Applicant in the previously-submitted response, neither does Zellweger et al. With the amendments presented herein, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are further distinguished from these two references. Neither of the references include any discussion of associating colors to the data groups in a multi-dimensional data set based as a result of applying one or more grouping rules to the numerical data set. Accordingly, the references cannot be combined to render obvious any of claims 49-75.

Each of the rejections asserted by the Examiner having been addressed, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 49-75 are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections asserted against claims 49-75 and pass this application quickly to issue.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be helpful, she is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

JEFFREY D. KARCESKI
Reg. No. 35914
Tel. No. 202.663.8403
Fax No. 202.663.8007

Date: October 16, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102